

REMARKS

Again, Claims 13, 15 and 17 were rejected as being anticipated by the disclosure of the cited Amir reference, and Claim 17 was rejected as being obvious in view of Amir combined with the disclosure of the Wolf reference. In response to those rejections, Applicant has amended the sole independent Claim 13 to provide clear patentable distinctions over the cited references. Those distinctions are explained herein.

As now set forth in amended independent Claim 13, an image processing apparatus of the present invention is arranged to reproduce one continuous video of a moving image, from a start thereof, for a predetermined reproduction time set in advance. As claimed, if the set predetermined reproduction time is passed without a first button being pressed, reproduction the one continuous video of the moving image is stopped. However, if the first button is pressed before the set predetermined reproduction time is passed from the start of reproduction of the one continuous video, reproduction of the one continuous video of the moving image is continued up to the end thereof even if the predetermined reproduction time is passed, and another continuous video of a next moving image, which is not included in the one continuous video of the moving image, is reproduced up to the end thereof. Also, if a second button is pressed during the reproduction of the one continuous video of the moving image continued after the first button is pressed before the predetermined reproduction time is passed, the continued reproduction of the one continuous video of the moving image is terminated and reproduction of the another continuous video of the next moving image is started in the same manner as the one continuous video.

Accordingly, in the present invention, one continuous video is reproduced from the start to the end thereof in the different manners in accordance with relationship between elapse of reproduction time from the start of reproduction of one continuous video and the depression timing of each of the first and second buttons. According to this feature of the present invention, a more useful slide show system is made available.

Referring now to the principal rejecting reference, the Amir application, it is disclosed in Figs.1-2 thereof to switch over reproduction between a skim video and full length video in response to click of a tab 18. In addition, Amir discloses reproduction of a play-list as an implementation of such switching between the videos ([0034]). Also, in the Office the Wolf reference is relied on as prior art that discloses merely that a digital camera is included in an image processing apparatus.

In this regard, Applicant respectfully submits that this combination of references does not even suggest Applicant's invention as now presented in amended Claim 13. That is, reproduction switching in Amir between the skim video and the full length video, is patentably distinct from the present invention (the reproducing unit and the determining unit) because Amir fails to disclose the reproduction of one continuous video of a moving image from the start thereof up to the end thereof in different manners in accordance with a relationship between elapse of reproduction time from the start of reproduction of one continuous video and depression timing of each of the first and second buttons. In this connection, it should be noted that Amir does not continue reproduction of the skim video but switches reproduction from the skim video to the full length video, if a button 18 is depressed. Amir therefore fails to disclose that if it is determined that the button 18 is depressed within a predetermined reproduction time

started from the start of reproduction of the skim video, then reproduction of the skim video is continued up to the end thereof and if not, reproduction of the skim video is stopped when the predetermined reproduction time elapses. Thus, Amir also fails to disclose or suggest that the reproduction unit functions together with the determining unit to continue to reproduce one continuous video in response to the first button being depressed within the predetermined time period started from the start of reproduction of the one continuous video as clearly recited in the amended Claim 13. Since Amir does not disclose or suggest continuing reproduction of the skim video in response to the button 18 being depressed, as described above, this reference also does not disclose or suggest stopping the continuing reproduction of the skim video in response to another button being depressed after the button 18 is depressed within the predetermined reproduction time started from the start of reproduction of the skim video. That is, Amir does not disclose or suggest the reproduction feature of one continuous video attained with depression of the second button in the manner recited in amended Claim 13.

Since the Wolf reference merely discloses an image processing apparatus including a digital camera and does not disclose or suggest the above-mentioned deficiencies of Amir as a rejecting reference, a combination of the disclosures of Amir and Wolf is to no avail as a basis for rejecting Applicants claim.

For these reasons it is respectfully submitted that Claim 13, as well as the claims dependent thereon, are allowable over the prior art, wherefore Applicant solicits the issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3939.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/John A. Krause/
John A. Krause
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 24,613

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 5532339v1